arXiv:1609.08360v1 [quant-ph] 27 Sep 2016

No fixed point guarantee of Nash equilibrium in quantum games

Faisal Shah Khan[*], Travis Humble[†]

September 28, 2016

Abstract

Nash equilibrium is not guaranteed in finite quantum games. In this letter, we revisit this fact using John Nash's original approach of countering sets and Kakutani's fixed point theorem. To the best of our knowledge, this mathematically formal approach has not been explored before in the context of quantum games. We use this approach to draw conclusions about Nash equilibrium states in quantum informational processes such as quantum computing and quantum communication protocols.

1 Introduction

Any quantum physical process modeled as a non-cooperative game describes a *quantum game* of the same type. The first instance of non-cooperative game theoretic modeling of quantum physical processes appears to be the 1980 work of A. Blaquiere [1] where wave mechanics are considered as a two player, zero-sum (strictly competitive) differential game and a minimax result is established for certain quantum physical aspects. The more recent and more sustained game theoretic treatment of quantum physical processes was initiated in 1999 with the work of D. Meyer [9]. Meyer's work only considered quantum computational and quantum algorithmic aspects of quantum physics as games, making the game theoretic analysis of these quantum systems more straight forward using finite-dimensional linear algebra instead of differential equations.

The year 1999 also saw the publication of the paper [3] by Eisert et al. in which a quantum informational model for the informational component of two players games was considered. This consideration was in the same spirit as the consideration of stochastic or randomization model for information in a game which produces the so-called *mixed* game. The quantum informational model of Eisert et al. produces a *quantized* game. The inspiration for considering extensions of the informational aspect of games to larger domains comes from John Nash's famous theorem [10] which not only innovates the solution concept of non-cooperative games as an equilibrium problem but, for the right kind of extension of the informational component of finite non-cooperative games, also guarantees its existence. The relative simplicity of the proof of Nash's theorem relies entirely on Kakutani's fixed point theorem [5].

[*]Quantum Computing Research Group, Applied Math & Sciences, Khalifa University, Abu Dhabi, UAE, Email: faisal.khan@kustar.ac.ae

[†]Quantum Computing Institute, Oak Ridge National Labs, TN, USA. Email: humblets@ornl.gov

As for the motivation behind Meyer's *gaming the quantum* approach, it lies in the fact that game theory has been fruitfully applied to several disciplines with the goal of constrained optimization of aspects of these disciplines, with economics and evolutionary biology being those that can be argued to have benefited the most. Along similar lines, Meyer's goal was to gain insights into the constrained optimal behavior of quantum algorithms, such as when some components of the algorithms were constrained to be classical.

It is important to note that even though both quantized games and gaming the quantum share a common game theoretic scaffolding, the former is game theoretically meaningful while the latter holds quantum physical meaning.

2 Non-cooperative games and Nash equilibrium

An n player, non-cooperative game in normal form is a function Γ

$$\Gamma : \prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i \longrightarrow O \tag{1}$$

with the additional feature of the notion of non-identical preferences over the elements of O for every "player" of the game. The factor S_i in the domain of Γ is the said to be the *strategy set* of player i, and a *play* of Γ is a n-tuple of strategies, one per player, producing a *payoff* to each player in terms of his preferences over the elements of O in the image of Γ. These preferences are typically quantified numerically for the ease of calculation of the payoffs. In this numerical context, Γ can be considered to be composed of component functions Γ_i which act as the *payoff functions* for each player i.

A *Nash equilibrium* is a play of Γ in which every player employs a strategy that is a *best reply*, with respects to his preferences over the outcomes, to the strategic choice of every other player. In other words, unilateral deviation from a Nash equilibrium by any one player in the form of a different choice of strategy will produce an outcome which is less preferred by that player than before. Following Nash, we say that a play π' of Γ *counters* another play π if $\Gamma_i(\pi') > \Gamma_i(\pi)$ for all players i, and that a self-countering play is an (Nash) equilibrium.

Let C_π denote the set of all the plays of Γ that counter π. Denote $\prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i$ by S for notational convenience, and note that $C_\pi \subset S$ and therefore $C_\pi \in 2^S$. Further note that the game Γ can be factored as

$$\Gamma : S \xrightarrow{\Gamma_C} 2^S \xrightarrow{E} O \tag{2}$$

where to any play p the map Γ_C associates its countering set C_p via the payoff functions Γ_i. The set-valued map Γ_C may be viewed as a pre-processing stage where players seek out a self-countering play, and if one is found, it is mapped to its corresponding outcome in O by the function E. The condition for the existence of a self-countering play, and therefore of a Nash equilibrium, is that Γ_C have a fixed point, that is, an element $p^* \in S$ such that $p^* \in \Gamma_C(p^*) = C_{p^*}$.

2.1 The mixed extension and fixed points

In a general set-theoretic setting for non-cooperative games, the map Γ_C may not have a fixed point. Hence, not all non-cooperative games will have a Nash equilibrium. However, according to

Nash's theorem, when the S_i are finite and the game is extended to its *mixed* version, that is, the version in which randomization via probability distributions is allowed over the elements of all the S_i, as well as over the elements of O, then Γ_C has at least one fixed point and therefore at least one Nash equilibrium.

Formally, given a game Γ with finite S_i for all i, its mixed version is the product function

$$\Lambda : \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Delta(S_i) \longrightarrow \Delta(O)$$

where $\Delta(S_i)$ is the set of probability distributions over the i^{th} player's strategy set S_i, and the set $\Delta(O)$ is the set of probability distributions over the outcomes O. Payoffs are now calculated as expected payoffs, that is, weighted averages of the values of Γ_i, for each player i, with respect to probability distributions in $\Delta(O)$ that arise as the product of the plays of Λ. Denote the expected payoff to player i by the function Λ_i. Also, note that Λ restricts to Γ. In such n-player games, at least one Nash equilibrium play is guaranteed to exist as a fixed point of Λ via Kakutani's fixed point theorem.

Kakutani's fixed point theorem: *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex, and let $F : S \to 2^S$ be an upper semi-continuous set-valued mapping such that $F(s)$ is non-empty, closed, and convex for all $s \in S$. Then there exists some $s^* \in S$ such that $s^* \in F(s^*)$.*

To see this, make $S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Delta(S_i)$. Then $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and S is non-empty, bounded, and closed because it is a finite product of finite non-empty sets. The set S is also convex because its the convex hull of the elements of a finite set. Next, let C_p be the set of all plays of Λ that counter the play p. Then C_p is non-empty, closed, and convex. Further, $C_p \subset S$ and therefore $C_p \in 2^S$. Since Λ is a game, it factors according to (2)

$$\Lambda : S \xrightarrow{\Lambda_C} 2^S \xrightarrow{E_\Pi} \Delta(O)$$

where the map Λ_C associates a play to its countering set via the payoff functions Λ_i. Since Λ_i are all continuous, Λ_C is continuous. Further, $\Lambda_C(s)$ is non-empty, closed, and convex for all $s \in S$ (we will establish the convexity of $\Lambda_C(s)$ below; the remaining conditions are also straightforward to establish). Hence, Kakutani's theorem applies and there exists an $s^* \in S$ that counters itself, that is, $s^* \in \Lambda_C(s^*)$, and is therefore a Nash equilibrium. The function E_Π simply maps s^* to $\Delta(O)$ as the product probability distribution from which the Nash equilibrium expected payoff is computed for each player.

The convexity of the $\Lambda_C(s) = C_p$ is straight forward to show. Let $q, r \in C_p$. Then

$$\Lambda_i(q) \geq \Lambda_i(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_i(r) \geq \Lambda_i(p) \tag{3}$$

for all i. Now let $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ and consider the convex combination $\mu q + (1-\mu)r$ which we will show to be in C_p. First note that $\mu q + (1-\mu)r \in S$ because S is the product of the convex sets $\Delta(S_i)$. Next, since the Λ_i are all linear, and because of the inequalities in (3) and the restrictions on the values of μ,

$$\Lambda_i(\mu q + (1-\mu)r) = \mu\Lambda_i(q) + (1-\mu)\Lambda_i(r) \geq \Lambda_i(p)$$

whereby $\mu q + (1-\mu)r \in C_p$ and C_p is convex.

Going back to the game Γ in (1) defined in the general set-theoretic setting, clearly Kakutani's theorem could be applicable to Γ if the conditions are right, such as when Γ is linear.

2.2 Generalzing Kakutani's theorem

Kakutani's fixed point theorem can be generalized to include subsets S of convex topological vector spaces, as was done by Glicksberg in [4]. The following is a paraphrased but equivalent statement of Glicksberg's fixed point theorem (the term "linear space" in the original statement of Glicksberg's theorem is equivalent to the term vector space):

Glicksberg's fixed point theorem: *Let S be nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex subset of a convex Hausdorff topological vector space and let $\Phi : S \to 2^S$ be an upper semi-continuous set-valued mapping such that $\Phi(s)$ is non-empty, closed, and convex for all $s \in S$. Then there exists some $s^* \in S$ such that $s^* \in \Phi(s^*)$.*

Using Glicksberg's fixed point theorem, one can show that Nash equilibrium exists in games where the strategy sets are infinite or possibly even uncountably infinite. In the next section, we contextualize the guarantee of Nash equilibrium in quantum games via Glicksberg's theorem.

3 Quantum games and Nash equilibrium

An n-player quantum game in normal form arises from (1) when one introduces quantum physically relevant restrictions. We declare a quantum game to be any quantum physically meaningful function

$$\mathcal{Q} : \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i$ is a complex Hilbert space acting as the set of strategies of player i, and $\mathcal{H}$ is the complex Hilbert space of outcomes. By analogy with mixed game extensions, or more generally, *stochastic games* where players' strategies are probability distributions over the elements of some set, the strategies of each player in a quantum game consist of quantum superpositions over the elements of a set of observables in $\mathcal{H}_i$. These strategic choices are then mapped by $\mathcal{Q}$ into elements of $\mathcal{H}$ over which the players have non-identical preferences defined.

Set $H = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i$ and $C_h \subset 2^H$ as the set of all countering plays of a play h of H. Then

$$\mathcal{Q} : H \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Q}_C} 2^H \xrightarrow{E_Q} \mathcal{H}$$

with the map $\mathcal{Q}_C$ taking a play to its countering set via payoff functions $\mathcal{Q}_i$ for each i, and the function E_Q takes a self-countering play, if it exists, to the Nash equilibrium quantum superposition in $\mathcal{H}$. In the search for a guarantee of Nash equilibrium in a quantum game, Kakutani's theorem cannot be invoked as $H \not\subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for any n. Hence, one looks to the more general Glicksberg's theorem. All except one component of a quantum game always meet the conditions of Glicksberg's theorem. The odd one out is the countering set $\mathcal{Q}_c(h) = C_h$ (for any h) which is not necessarily convex.

The convexity of the countering sets depends on the properties of the function $\mathcal{Q}$, or the payoff functions $\mathcal{Q}_i$ more precisely. In particular, if these functions are linear or even semi-linear, then convexity of the countering sets follows immediately from (3) with the Λ_i replaced with $\mathcal{Q}_i$. Hence, to guarantee Nash equilibrium via fixed points in a quantum game, it is sufficient that the $\mathcal{Q}_i$ all be (semi) linear.

However, this is not the case generally, even in *finite quantum games* where each $\mathcal{H}_i$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are assumed to have only finitely many observable states. In a finite quantum game, it is straightforward to define non-identical preferences of the players over the finite number of observable states b_j of $\mathcal{H}$, and then induce preferences over arbitrary quantum superpositions of these observable states in $\mathcal{H}$ [6]. This allows one to define the payoff functions $\mathcal{Q}_i$ in a quantum physically meaningful way as the expected value of the game $\mathcal{Q}$ via the inner-product of the output q of $\mathcal{Q}$ and the observable states b_j of $\mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathcal{Q}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j \left|\langle q, b_j\rangle\right|^2,$$

where the a_j are the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Q}$. Note the general quadratic nature of the payoff functions $\mathcal{Q}_i$. Hence, finite quantum games don't have fixed point guarantee for the the existence of Nash equilibrium. Rather, a case by case study of quantum games is needed, or a mechanism design approach using the inner-product on $\mathcal{H}$ as first proposed in [7].

For mixed extensions of finite quantum games or stochastic finite quantum games, the payoff functions are defined via the trace operation and are therefore linear. Hence, the countering sets will be convex in this case and Glicksberg theorem will apply [9], guaranteeing at least one Nash equilibrium in the mixed finite quantum game.

We end this section with a discussion of quantum entanglement and where it fits in the context of quantum games. There exist extensions of Γ beyond the mixed one known as "mediated communication". Mediated communication corresponds to the situation where a probability distribution in $\Delta(O)$ is desired so as to increase the value of the payoff functions, but which is not available in the image of the mixed extension. This is achieved as follows. A neutral referee starts with a non-product probability distribution P over the outcomes of a finite non-cooperative game Γ and advises each player to engage in a play Π of Γ with respect to P. If each player agrees with the referee's advice after having evaluated his expected payoff with respect to P, then the play Π is said to be a correlated equilibrium and the larger game with mediation is called a *correlated game*. A more formal mathematical discussion of correlated games appears in [2]. Quantum entanglement maybe considered as a form of mediated quantum communication and an extension of a quantum game's image in $\mathcal{H}$ so as to include non-factorisable quantum superpositions. Quantum entanglement does not appear to offer any immediate insights into the existence of fixed points in correlated quantum games, such as the linearity of the payoff functions.

4 Discussion

What does quantum game theory offer quantum information processing? For stochastic quantum processes, when modeled as quantum games, Glickesburg theorem guarantees a Nash equilibrium outcome which can be viewed as an optimal solution to an optimization problem with constraints

defined over the outcomes of the process. For instance, quantum key distribution is a stochastic quantum process and can be cast as stochastic quantum game where a coalition of players attempting to share an electronic key (Alice and Bob) engage in a non-cooperative way with the eavesdropper (Eve). Alice and Bob for instance want to amplify privacy whereas Eve does not, and in fact may want to decrease it. Or, Alice and Bob may wish to reconcile the information in such protocols whereas Eve would not want to. If the Alice and Bob coalition and Eve try to achieve their respective outcomes via random quantum processes, then Glickesburg theorem will guarantee an optimal solution, with respect to the prefence constraints, in the form of a Nash equilibrium.

In a quantum computational setting, things can be said to be more interesting as Nash equilibrium are not guaranteed. In this setting, quantum search algorithms or state amplification algorithms can be viewed as zero-sum games between a player and Nature. The item being searched for is the most preferred item of the player with control over one qubit, while Nature, with her $(n-1)$ qubits prefers anything but that. Which quantum search algorithms have a fixed point guaranteed Nash equilibrium? Recently, Yoder et al. [11] presented a quantum search algorithm for finding fixed points. It would be interesting to explore whether any connections exist between such algorithms and fixed points of quantum games.

Finally, we point out that while zero-sum quantum games (stochastic or otherwise) may appear to find more applications in quantum information processing, more general quantum game models are also possible for quantum information processing. An example of a quantum Prisoners Dilemma's application to quantum computing can be found in [8]. It would be correct to say that applications of non-zero sum quantum games to quantum information processing is an area of scientific query yet to be fully explored.

5 Acknowledgment

Faisal Shah Khan is indebted to Davide La Torre from the department of Applied Math & Sciences at Khalifa University for helpful discussion on the topic of fixed point theorems.

References

[1] A. Blaquiere, *Wave mechanics as a two-player game*, Dynamical Systems and Microphysics 33, 1980.

[2] S. Bleiler, *A formalism for quantum games and an application*, preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.1389.

[3] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, M. Lewenstien, *Quantum Games and Quantum Strategies* Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3077 Published 11 October 1999.

[4] I. L. Glicksberg, *A further generalization of the Kakutani fixed point theorem, with application to Nash equilibrium points*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 3 (1952) 170174.

[5] S Kakutani, *A generalization of Brouwer's fixed point theorem*, Duke Math. J. Volume 8, Number 3 (1941), 457-459.

[6] F.S. Khan, S.J.D. Phoenix, *Gaming the Quantum*, Quantum Information & Computation Volume 13 Issue 3-4, March 2013 Pages 231-244.

[7] F.S.Khan, S.J.D. Phoenix, *Mini-maximizing two qubit quantum computations*, Quantum Information Processing, Volume 12, Number 12, 2013.

[8] F.S.Khan, *Dominant strategies in two qubit quantum computations*, Quantum Information Processing, 10.1007/s11128-015-0945-9, 2015.

[9] D. Meyer, *Quantum Strategies*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 1052-1055.

[10] J. Nash, *Equilibrium Points in N-player Games*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 36, (1950), 48-49.

[11] T. J. Yoder, G.H. Low, I. L. Chuang, *Fixed-Point Quantum Search with an Optimal Number of Queries*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 210501 Published 18 November 2014.